App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1939. (Cens.)

File No. 30-39

Serial Nos. 1-5

Later References.

PRESERVED

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for July/40.

SUBJECT.

Seperate Enumeration of Rajaput in the 1941 Census.

WD 0573—GPB—22,500—12-9-39

10-11-40

Serial No.

Letter No 40 dated 10-1-40 from the Secretary of the Rajaput Maharsabha, requesting that their suggestion that the Rajaput community may be ~~recorded~~ classed separately in the ~~for~~ Census of 1941 be considered favourably

1) The previous papers on the subject were sent to the Census Supdt on 3-1-40 (G.M.D. No. 566). If approved, this will also be sent to him. Subd. with a draft

18/1

18/1

2 To ~~the Hon. Sec.~~, Rajput Mahasabha, Delhi.
No. Q. 6663 D 24-1-1940
Stating that his request has been referred to the Census Supdt.

Copy to the Census Supdt.
No. Q. 6664 D 24-1-1940

3 From the Census Supdt.
Letter No. 1117 dated 30-5-40.
States that for the reasons explained, the Rajp should be separately tabulated during the Cen of 1941.

It is explained in para 2 of the P.U.B the

Separate enumeration of the Rajput Community during the census of 1941.

3039 (—5104 — 9m

Census File No. 30 of 1939

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial No.

The Rajputs are a Community distinct from the other main Community Viz Arasu (classed as "Kshatriya" in the State. In para 3, reference is invited to paras 348, 352 and 359 of the Census Report of 1931 wherein Mr. Venkatesha Iyengar (as Census Supdt) has specifically discussed the very same question. The Census Supdt. says that he entirely agrees with the above views of Mr. Venkatesha Iyengar in the opinion that the Rajput Community should be separately tabulated during 1941. ~~For ordering~~ The Census Supdt's Opinion may be accepted.

BRG 1/6.

Dear Key 2/6

2nd. cl.)

19.6.40

9/6

19/6

Submitted with 2 drafts.

BRG 27/6/40.

27/6

29/6

No. 1 / dated 1.7.40.

To the Census Supdt

Conveys approval to the Separate tabulation of the Rajput Community during the census of 1941.

GOVT OF MYSORE
OFFICE OF SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL.
14 JUNE 1940
No. 1773

TYPING SECTION
29 JUNE 1940

5104

General and Revenue Secretariat — Census — File No. 30 of 1947 — [App. F. III–2

Serial No.	
5	No 2/ dated 1.7.40 Mr. Gopala Singh. Mysore States that instructions have been issued to the Census Supdt as above.

Census-30-39-1 Gen-3039.

821

The Rajaput Upakarini Provincial Mahasabha,

Mysore, (S. India.)

10-1-1940.

10th January 1940.

To

The General Secretary

to the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,

Bangalore.

4.566

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
12 JAN. 1940

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. G1625/GM of 12-8-1939 communicating that our request for classifying the Rajaput Community under a separate category in the Census of 1941 will be referred for disposal to the Census Superintendent after he is appointed, it was resolved in the General Meeting of the Association held on 24-12-1939 to further request you to conside the matter favourably. and hope our prayer will be granted.

C.M 12.1

Thanking you in anticipation,

We beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servants,

For The Rajaput Upakarini Provincial Mahasabh

P.H. Gopal singh

Secretary.

Address:-
P.H. Gopal Singh,
Hon. Secretary,
R.U.P. Mahasabha,
Rajput Block,
Narasimharaja Mohalla,
Mysore.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

(2

Dated, Bangalore, 22nd January 1940.

No. 76663, 24 R

From

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Department.

To

Mr.P.H.Gopal Singh,
Honoray Secretary, Rajaput Upakarini Provincial Mahasabha, Rajaput Block, Narasimharaja Mohalla, Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.40 dated 10th January 1940 addressed to the General Secretary, intimating that in the General meeting of your Association held on 24th December 1939, it was resolved to request Government to consider your previous request regarding the separate classification of Rajaputs in the Census of 1941 favourably I am directed to state that your request has been referred to the Census Superintendent.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/- C.E.Noronha,

Secretary to Government,
Development Department.

Memo No. 76664/Encl

Copy of the above is forwarded, with compliments, to the Census Superintendent, together with a copy of letter No.40 dated 10th January 1940 of the Secretary, Rajaput Upakarini Provincial Mahasabha, in continuation of the file on the subject sent on 3rd January 1940.

By Order,

SR/3/1

For Secretary to Government,
Development Department.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT... .....

.....

.....

Section ~~Genl~~ Censors

File No. 30-39

Serial No. 2.

Diary No. of letter replied to.. .....

No. G. 6663

To ~~The~~ Mr. P.H. Gopal Singh,
Hony. secretary
Rajaput Upakarini pro-
vincial Mahasabha,
Rajput Block,
Narasimharaja Mohalla,
Mysore

General and Revenue Secretariat

the *193*

Date of issue 23/1/40

Signed by..... Hm. for S.S.C

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 40 dated 10-1-40 addressed to the General secretary intimating that in the general meeting of your Assn. held on 24-12-1939 it was resolved to request Govt. to consider your previous request regarding the separate classification of Rajaputs in the census of 1941 I am directed to state that

ist of enclosures.... ....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

your request has been
referred to the Census
supdt.

~~Yours~~ faithfully ...

by
Secy. to Govt
Dev. Deptt

memo G6664,
Encl. 1

copy of the above is
forwarded with compts. to
the Census supdt., together
with a copy of ~~the~~ letter
No. 40 dated 10-1-40 of the
secretary of the R.U.P. Mahasabha,
in continuation of the file
on the subject sent on 8-1-40

By order

by

Secy. to Govt
Dev. Deptt

12 18/1

OFFICE OF THE CENSUS SUPERINTENDENT
IN MYSORE,

Dated Bangalore, 30th May 194 0.

1117
18w

From

L. H. KRISHNA RAO, Esq., M.A.,
CENSUS SUPERINTENDENT IN MYSORE,
BANGALORE.

To

Charles E Noronha, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to Government,
Development Department,
Bangalore

SIR,

With reference to your Memo No: G.6664 dated the 24th January 1940 and the subsequent reminder thereto, No: G.9677 dated the 20th May 1940, in the matter of classifying the "Rajaputs" as a separate community in the Census of 1941, I have the honour to state that separate figures of the Rajaput population in the State are available for the Census of 1881 and 1891 though they were grouped as Kshatriyas along with Arasu and Rajabinde communities. These figures are not separately available from the Census of 1901 as they are merged in the Kshatriya caste.

2. The Rajaput population in 1891 was 8,000 out of a total Kshatriya population of 15,000, and assuming that it has retained the same proportion, it may now be taken at 20,000, as the total Kshatriya population is now 40,000. On the one hand, the community may be considered to be too small for being tabulated separately; but on the other hand, it is a community distinct from the other main community, Arasu, classed as "Kshatriya" in the State, having migrated from Northern India and having very little in common with that community in language or customs and having certainly no inter-marriage and inter-dining with it.

3. In this connection, I would also invite the kind reference of Government to paras 348, 352 and 359 of the Report on the Mysore Census of 1931. Mr. Venkatesaiengar has specifically taken up this question: "The caste shown as Kshatriya includes diverse communities like Arasu, Kodaga and Raju, coming ~~of~~ from

different stocks, speaking different languages, having different ways of social life and not inter-dining or inter-marrying with one another..... Should not the Arasu, the Chattri, the Kodaga and the Raju communities be shown as separate castes rather than as sub-castes of the one caste "Kshatriya"?..... For a set of people to be a caste there must be some connection between them in origin..... To treat every small group as a caste because it desires to be so treated is not possible. (But at the same time), to club together a large number of such groups into one caste for the purposes of a census may simplify tabulation, but it is not correct. A scientific classification has to avoid both extremes and group only such communities as really are parts of larger groups into castes and treat smaller groups as separate unrelated castes". (Para 348). .....He has also suggested that the next Census should deal with the question more satisfactorily. In para 352 he goes on to observe: "What the Census does is not to perpetuate distinctions which the people wish to abolish but to make a record of the distinctions which the population is desirous of having recorded. Progressive opinion possibly influenced by political considerations may object to the institution of caste and to the record of caste in a Census, but the fact remains that the caste return is of importance in the eyes of the people..... Each community wants to raise its status in society, to learn more and live better. Each community wants its members to have chances of education and employment.....Leaders of the communities need information about the existing conditions of their communities and other communities.....It is the business of a census to provide this information. Not to provide it would be a serious omission in a census. To take the whole population and say that the growth is 10% in ten years or that the percentage of literates is 9 or that the proportion of girl wives is so much per cent, would give no indication of the differences between community and community. So far from helping social improvement, such clouding of fact would mislead the people". Caste consciousness has been greatly strengthened as a result of Government giving special facilities for education

by providing a large number of scholarships for students of the backward classes and by framing special rules for giving appointments in Government Offices to persons of the backward classes. Hope of obtaining employment at the end of the educational course has given a great impetus to education and generally to public endeavour to improve their position in all these castes and each caste is naturally anxious to know how it stands in the matter of education and representation in the public services. (Para 359)

4. I entirely agree with the views of Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar and I am of opinion that the Rajaput community should be separately tabulated during the Census of 1941.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Census Superintendent.

Appendix F G—1]

2 drafts

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Census.

File No. 30-39

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 1

To The Census Superintendent in mysore

Sir,

Subject: Separate enumeration of the Rajputs during the census of 1941

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19*

Date of issue 1/7/40

Signed by Mr. C.S.S.C

with reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 1117 dated the 30th may 1940 on the above Subject, I am directed to convey the approval of Govt. to the separate tabulation of the Rajput Community during the Censers of 1941.

I have etc.

for Secretary to Govt

Dev-dept.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

BRS 27/6.

Examined by.....

WD 03695—GPB—30,000—29-1-40

Appendix F. G—1]

2 drafts.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Census

File No. 30-39

Serial No. 5

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. G 2,

To Mr P.H. Gopal Singh,
Honorary Secretary.
Rajaput Upakarini Provincial
Mahasabha, Rajaput Block,
Narasimharaja Mohalla,
Mysore

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *19*

Date of issue 1/7/40

Signed by Mr. C.S.S.C

Sir,

In continuation of this Office
letter No. G. 6663/ dated 24.1.40,
I am directed to state that instructions
have been issued to the Census Supdt
in mysore that the Rajput Community
should be separately tabulated during
the Census of 1941.

I have etc

G

Secretary to Government,
Development Dept.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

BRS
27/6.

WD 03695—GPB—30,000—29-1-40